



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,187	12/16/2005	Satoshi Araki	277514US6PCT	3916
22850 7590 03/12/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER SU, SARAH	
			ART UNIT 2431	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/12/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,187	Applicant(s) ARAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Sarah Su	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,8 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

FINAL ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 29 December 2008, has been entered into record. In this amendment, claims 1-24 have been amended.
2. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. With regards to the objection to the drawings, the applicant has submitted amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the objection.
4. With regards to the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph of claim 12, the applicant has submitted amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection.
5. With regards to the rejection under 35 USC 101 of claims 11 and 24, the applicant has submitted amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection.
6. Applicant's arguments filed 29 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1-24, it is argued by the applicant that Imazu does not disclose registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus and a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Imazu discloses that a registration identifier is used to authenticate a user, then a login identifier is entered into a login screen in order to authenticate the user based on the login identifier and that each of these identifiers identifies the user and/or communication device (0014, lines 4-14).

Art Unit: 2431

Therefore, since the login identifier can only be entered after the user is authenticated based on a registration identifier, these identifiers are not the same.

Specification

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 11 and 24 have been amended to recite “a computer readable storage medium” in line 1. This computer readable storage medium has not been disclosed in the specification.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 5, 6, 8, and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. In claim 5, line 5: “second user identification information” is unclear if it relates to “a second user identification information” (claim 3, line 5);
 - b. In claim 6, line 6: “the contents data” lacks antecedent basis;
 - c. In claim 8, line 5: “a service” is unclear if it relates to “a service” (claim 1, line 4);
 - d. In claim 23, line 4: “a service utilizing apparatus” is unclear if it relates to “a service utilizing apparatus” (claim 23, lines 1-2).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imazu (US 2002/0087892 A1).

As to claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24, Imazu discloses a system and method for authentication, the system and method having:

transmitting registration information according to an external input, the registration information including a first user identification information (i.e. login identifier) for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus, a first password corresponding to the first user identification information, and a first apparatus name (i.e. registration identifier) of the service utilizing apparatus to a management apparatus, wherein the management apparatus manages the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13);

receiving registration completion information (i.e. login screen display) transmitted from the management apparatus after completing registration with the first user identification information, the first password, and the first apparatus name (0065, lines 5-9; 0072, lines 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu.

As to claim 13, Imazu discloses:

wherein in the registering, if the first user identification information, the first password, and the first apparatus name received from a first service utilizing apparatus are associated and registered (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13),

but does not explicitly disclose:

a second user identification information, a second password, and a second apparatus name identical to the first apparatus name are received from a second service utilizing apparatus, and the second user identification information is different from the user identification information, then the second user identification information, the second password, and the second apparatus name are associated with one another and registered. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a second user on the same

Art Unit: 2431

terminal using different user information since it was known in the art that personal authentication using user name and password is needed in a multi-user computer system or network to verify that the communicating party is real, as shown in Imazu (0006, lines 15-23).

13. Claims 2-8 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aboulhoshn et al. (US 2004/0068524 A1 and Aboulhoshn hereinafter).

As to claims 2 and 14, Imazu discloses:

receiving authentication request information comprising the first user identification information (i.e. login identifier) and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 11-14);

performing an authentication process based on the received first user identification information and first password (0077, lines 1-6);

transmitting authentication results (i.e. URL of registration screen) of the authentication process to the service utilizing apparatus as a result of transmitting the authentication results to the service utilizing apparatus (0072, lines 1-3);

Imazu does not disclose:

receiving contents identification information about at least predetermined contents data for request of the contents data transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus;

**transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received
contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses a system and method for peer-to-peer file sharing, the system and method having:

**receiving contents identification information (i.e. request for
content/virtual file) about at least predetermined contents data for request of
the contents data transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0013,
lines 24-27);**

**transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received
contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus (0013,
lines 26-27).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transmitting data according to an identifier. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that transmitting data that is stored at a location reduces the need for centralized file storage (0003, lines 9-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by transmitting data according to an identifier in order to allow data to be stored at different locations while allowing them to be accessed.

Art Unit: 2431

As to claims 3 and 15, Imazu does not disclose:

transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of a second apparatus registered as associated with a second user identification information different from the first user identification information to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving the name of the second apparatus transmitted according to the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus;

displaying the received name of the second apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of a second apparatus registered as associated with a second user identification information different from the first user identification information to the service utilizing apparatus (0015, lines 21-23);

receiving the name of the second apparatus transmitted according to the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus (0014, lines 2-6);

displaying the received name of the second apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

Art Unit: 2431

modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving and displaying another apparatus name. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that receiving and displaying other apparatus names allows files to be shared with groups (0014, lines 3-4) and for a user to view the shared file structure (0019, lines 1-3). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by receiving and displaying another apparatus name in order to allow for files to be shared and for the file structure to be viewed.

As to claims 4 and 16, Imazu does not disclose:

receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published; registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published (i.e. accept or decline) (0016, lines 17-21);

Art Unit: 2431

registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other (0016, lines 20-21).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by registering an apparatus with disclosure information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that registering an apparatus with information regarding its group membership ensures that a computer system is authorized to be a member (0016, lines 5-7). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by registering an apparatus with membership information in order to ensure that a computer is authorized to be a member.

As to claims 5 and 17, Imazu does not disclose:

receiving the name of the second apparatus set to be published among the names of second apparatuses registered as associated with second user identification information.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

receiving the name of the second apparatus set to be published among the names of second apparatuses registered as associated with second user identification information (0016, lines 20-21).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving the name of another apparatus to be registered. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claims 4 and 16 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

As to claims 6 and 18, Imazu does not disclose:

receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester of predetermined contents data and comprising the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the second apparatus name of the second service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data;

transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the second service utilizing apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester (i.e. file sharing system) of predetermined contents data and comprising the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the second apparatus name of the second service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data (0013, lines 24-27);

transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the second service utilizing apparatus (0013, lines 26-27).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transferring information to a requested apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that providing a copy of a file to an accessing member allows peer-to-peer file sharing (0013, lines 13-14), reducing the need for a centralized storage space (0003, lines 9-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by transferring data to a requested system in order to allow file sharing and reduce the amount of centralized storage space needed.

As to claim 7, Imazu discloses:

transmitting a second user identification information and a second password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).

Imazu does not disclose:

displaying information about a second apparatus name corresponding to the second user identification information and the second password in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

displaying information about a second apparatus name (i.e. computer system identifier) corresponding to the second user identification information and the second password in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying information about an apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that sharing apparatus information allows other group members to be notified of newly shared or modified files (0013, lines 27-29). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by sharing apparatus information in order to update file sharing information with group members.

As to claim 8, Imazu discloses:

transmitting a second user identification information and a second password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).

Imazu does not disclose:

displaying information about a service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to the second identification information about the service;

transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

displaying information about a service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to the second identification information about the service (0019, lines 1-5);

transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input (0018, lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2431

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying file sharing information and transmitting apparatus deletion information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that displaying file sharing information provides a user interface for the shared file structure (0019, lines 11-13) and providing deletion information allows file synchronization to be suspended (0018, line 6). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu by displaying service information and providing deletion information in order to provide a user interface and suspend file synchronization.

As to claim 19, Imazu discloses:

authenticating the first user identification information and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).

Imazu does not disclose:

transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the first user identification information and the first password to the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply corresponding to the authentication.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

Art Unit: 2431

transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the first user identification information and the first password to the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply corresponding to the authentication (0015, lines 4-7; 0016, lines 20-23).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transferring information about an apparatus with user information. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 7 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

As to claim 20, Imazu discloses:

authenticating the first user identification information and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).

Imazu does not disclose:

transmitting identification information about a service used by the first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as evidenced by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

transmitting identification information about a service used by the first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus (0016, lines 20-23; 0015, lines 4-7; 0019, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Aboulhosn by sending information about file sharing (i.e. service) of an apparatus. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 8 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu.

14. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Oho et al. (US 2002/0184515 A1 and Oho hereinafter).

As to claims 9 and 21, Imazu in view of Aboulhosn discloses:

storing the first apparatus name (0024, lines 21-23) in order to register the apparatus to ensure that it is authorized to be a member.

Imazu in view of Aboulhosn does not disclose:

transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the first stored apparatus name to the management apparatus;

receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the first apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus;

deleting the stored first apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information;

transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the first apparatus name registered in the management apparatus;

receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the first apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhoshn, as evidenced by Oho.

Oho discloses a system and method for rights management, the system and method having:

transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the first stored apparatus name to the management apparatus (0237, lines 9-11);

receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the first apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus (0238, lines 1-3); deleting the stored first apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information (0239, lines 2-4); transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the first apparatus name registered in the management apparatus (0238, lines 6-11); receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the first apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus (0240, lines 2-7).

Given the teaching of Oho, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn with the teachings of Oho by deleting an apparatus and sending a deletion confirmation. Oho recites motivation by disclosing that deleting an identifier from a rights database is used to control license information (0237, lines 3-6) and transmitting a deletion confirmation notifies the user that the identifier has been correctly deleted (0241, lines 8-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Oho would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn by deleting an apparatus name and providing deletion confirmation in order to control licensing information and confirm proper deletion.

15. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Aboulhosn as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Bradee (US 2002/0095571 A1) and Satyavolu et al. (US 2003/0191964 A1 and Satyavolu hereinafter).

As to claim 22, Imazu in view of Aboulhosn does not disclose:

performing a user authentication process based on the first user identification information and the first password received in the authentication request information receiving, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an

Art Unit: 2431

authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server;

issuing a service session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus, wherein,

in the receiving, the server receives the service session ID and the contents identification information;

in the transmitting, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID, and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhoshn, as evidenced by Bradee.

Bradee discloses:

performing a user authentication process based on the first user identification information and the first password received in the authentication request information receiving, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0041, lines 1-8);

issuing a service session ID which is a session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0042, lines 2-3, 5-6), wherein, in the receiving, the server receives the service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) and the contents identification information (i.e. resource name) (0042, lines 17-19);

in the transmitting, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) , and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed (i.e. permitting access) (0042, lines 13-16, 34-36).

Given the teaching of Bradee, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhoshn with the teachings of Bradee by using a session ID and service session ID in the authentication process to transmit data.

Bradee recites motivation by disclosing that using a session ID and surrogate ID to control access to data allows the data to be accessed for a certain amount of time before expiration (0043, lines 7-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Bradee would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhoshn by using a session ID and surrogate ID to allow access to data in order to limit access to a certain amount of time.

Art Unit: 2431

Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee does not disclose:

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee, as evidenced by Satyavolu.

Satyavolu discloses:

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token) corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and

transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus (0030, lines 1-7; 0031, lines 1-2);
receiving from the server an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token)
transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server (0031, lines 7-9).

Given the teaching of Satyavolu, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee with the teachings of Satyavolu by using a ticket for authentication. Satyavolu recites motivation by disclosing that a ticket allows a user to avoid traditional authentication login requirements for a certain amount of time (0031, lines 9-12). It is obvious that the teachings of Satyavolu would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Aboulhosn and Bradee by using a ticket in order to allow a user to bypass traditional login requirements for a given amount of time.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2431

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431